REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative during the interview conducted on April 6, 2009. The substance of the interview is reflected in the remarks below.

In the Office Action the Examiner has maintained the prior art rejections. More specifically, claims 1-5, 9-16, 20-22, 25, 26, 29-32 and 34-35 remain rejected under 35 § U.S.C. 102(b) over Hobbs (US Patent No. 5,197,138), and claims 6-8, 17-19, 27-28, 33 and 36 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hobbs in view of Radhakrishna (U.S. Patent No. 6,823,414).

Amended independent claim 1 recites "specifying a global interrupt threshold value that is applicable to all of the plurality of active threads; and processing a requested interrupt only when the interrupt priority value of the requested interrupt is higher than the global interrupt threshold value."

In contrast, Hobbs discloses that "[a]n interrupt will not be recognized or serviced by the processor until the priority of the code thread is lower than the priority of the interrupt." (See col. 2, lines 54-57.) Thus, Hobbs compares the priorities of two different individual processor functions (i.e., code thread and interrupt). This is different from determining whether a priority of an interrupt is higher than a global threshold value that is applicable to all of the plurality of active threads, as claimed. Therefore, independent claim 1 is patentable over Hobbs for at least this reason.

Since independent claims 22, 25, and 29 include limitations similar to the limitation discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, they are patentable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Dependent claims 2-5, 9-16, 20, 21, 26, 20-32, 34, and 35 depend either directly or indirectly from the independent claims, and are therefore patentable over the applied reference for at least the same reasons.

Radhakrishna was applied as allegedly teaching features recited in dependent claims 6-8, 17-19, 27, 28, 33, and 36. Radhakrishna fails to make up for the deficiencies of Hobbs. Thus,

claims 6-8, 17-19, 27, 28, 33, and 36 are patentable by virtue of their dependence on independent claim 1.

Applicant has added new dependent claims 37-40. The Examiner states in the Interview Summary dated April 13, 2009, that Applicant's amendment "appears to suggest" that there is a single register that applies to multiple threads. Although Applicant believes the word "global" in the context of the claims necessarily means there is a single value, out of an abundance of caution Applicant has added dependent claims 37-40, which more explicitly recite this feature. More specifically, dependent claim 37 recites "wherein the global interrupt threshold value is a single global interrupt threshold value," and dependent claims 38-40 each recite a similar limitation. Claims 37-40 are patentable over the applied references at least by virtue of their respective dependencies on the independent claims.

In view of the above, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

In the event a fee is required or if any additional fee during the prosecution of this application is not paid, the Patent Office is authorized to charge the underpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2215.

Dated: April 20, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By Laura C. Brutman

Laura C. Brutman
    Registration No.: 38,395
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 277-6500
Attorney for Applicant